



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,284	08/13/2001	Kazutaka Inoue		5139

7590 10/15/2004  
Law Office of Townsend & Banta  
601 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Suite 900 South Building  
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

LAM, ANN Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/890,284

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

Ann Y. Lam

Art Unit

1641

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2,3,5 and 6.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



10/5/04

*Christopher L. Chin*  
CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800/1641

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues on pages 6-7 that the McNichols reference does not and cannot detect a reactive current or a residual voltage since the potential sensed in the McNichols device is sensed during a pulse, and not during an off-period of an output. Examiner points out that in any case, Applicant claims a detection circuit in subparagraph (a) or subparagraph (b), and that McNichols at the least discloses the circuit in subparagraph (a), (see the sensory circuit in column 9, lines 41-44). Applicant also argues on page 8 that R5 and R6 are not coupled to a negative output terminal. Examiner asserts that the circuit disclosed in column 14, lines 28-51 disclose a circuit wherein the resistors are coupled to the negative output terminal since they are connected to the active electrode (116), (col. 14, line 41; the active electrode is the negative output terminal). Examiner notes that Applicant does not specify details of how the resistors are coupled to the negative output terminal, for example, there are no limitations requiring that the resistors are directly coupled to the negative output terminal, etc. Applicant also argues on page 8 that the capacitor C2 of McNichols is not able to smooth out the waveform across a switch. Examiner reasserts that the McNichols device has a switch in order to turn the circuit on or off. Also Applicant gives the disclosure to capacitor C5 in support of Applicant's assertion. However, Examiner points to column 14, lines 11-51 in the rejection. Examiner asserts that the capacitor C1 or C2 is capable of smoothing out a waveform as claimed.